



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## Short Notices

PATON, DAVID, "Early Egyptian Records of Travel." Vol. II, *Some Texts of the XVIIIth Dynasty, Exclusive of the Annals of Thutmosis III.* Princeton, N.J.: University Press, 1916. \$7.50 net.

The second volume of Mr. David Paton's "Early Egyptian Records of Travel in Western Asia," the first volume of which was reviewed in the October, 1916, issue of this *Journal*, deals with the XVIIIth Dynasty (1580-1350 B.C.), the climactic point of Egyptian activity abroad. The Annals of Thutmose III, who definitely established Egyptian supremacy in Hither Asia, are reserved for a third volume. That now at hand contains the records of his royal predecessors and of both their and his officials. To the contemporary documents is added a slightly later folk-tale relating how Thuti, one of Thutmose's generals, took Joppa.

Each page of the new volume is numbered and bears also the table number and designation, supplying welcome means of reference entirely lacking in Vol. I. But the cumbrous sign-by-sign collation, for the use of which Erman's "Aegyptische Grammatik" is necessary, is retained. This column, then, lies beyond the layman's facilities; for the specialist, a consecutive facsimile of the hieroglyphic text (Mr. Paton has himself found occasion to draw several sign-groups) would be preferable, doing away with time-consuming references to the additional volume. The transliteration, in the next column, continues to suffer somewhat from misunderstandings.<sup>1</sup> The accompanying translation might also be improved by clearer indication of syntactical relations. The final column, winnowed from the context, again (in spite of the cover-title) includes many place-names other than Asiatic. Even among the latter the uninitiated might not realize that "Qariqamiaša" (p. 41, omitted from this column by oversight) is Carchemish, where the British Museum was excavating at the outbreak of

<sup>1</sup> The following illustrations may be mentioned:

The fem. genitive *nt* is made into the masc. relative pronoun *nti* (pp. 14, 25, etc.).  
Phonetic complements are given full independent value.

The 1st per. pronoun is read *nwk* (p. 41, l. 1), contrasting with the correct form *ynk* (p. 42, l. 24).

*Bit* regularly appears instead of the correct nisbe form *Biš* for the title "King of Lower Egypt."

*Nšwt*, "thrones," is intermittently confused with *Nšwt*, "king," in Amon's title "Lord of Karnak" (pp. 12, 25, etc.).

The name "Pen-nekhtbet" appears as "Pen-nekht-bet" (p. 6) and "Pennektbet" (p. 7).

On p. 5, l. 2, for *Šdt inr wd nfr*, "What was taken out was excellent white stone," read *Šdt(w) inr ḥd nfr*, "Fine white stone was taken out" (passive in *tw* instead of participle).

On p. 4, l. 31, the royal figure following *ḥm* is not a determinative, but the 1st per. suffix.

the war, or that "Haarabw-land" is really the city of Aleppo. The bibliography remains thoroughly up to date and bewilderingly comprehensive. Both Mr. Paton and his typist, Mr. Welter, deserve hearty appreciation for the labor which they are continuing to lavish upon their task.<sup>1</sup> The reviewer ventures to suggest, however, that printed instead of typewritten tables would be clearer, and easier on the reader's eyesight.

T. GEORGE ALLEN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

SCHAEFFER, HENRY, PH.D., *The Social Legislation of the Primitive Semites*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1915. Pp. xvi+245, 8vo.

This book is a careful, fair-minded discussion of the social legislation of the civilized Semitic nations: the Babylonians, Hebrews, and Mohammedan Arabs. Why the author called them "primitive Semites" it is difficult to imagine. The term primitive as applied to them is altogether a misnomer. The work is nevertheless a most useful compilation of material, and the comparative treatment adds much to its value.

The subjects treated are: "Matriarchy," "Patriarchy," "Agnation," "The Goel" or "Next of Kin," "Slavery," "Interest," "Pledges and Security," "The Social Problem as Viewed by the Prophets," "Poor Laws," "Sabbatical Year," "The Year of Jubilee," "Ezekiel's Plan of Allotment," "Taxation and Tribute," and "The Development of Individual Landownership in Israel." It will be seen from this list of subjects that the writer's chief interest is biblical. Each subject, however, is illuminated by material from Babylonia and Islam wherever such material exists, the Code of Hammurapi furnishing much. Since the biblical material is made so prominent, the book should appeal to all students of the Bible. The positions taken are sane and are substantiated by the evidence. We welcome Dr. Schaeffer to the ranks of Semitic scholarship.

GEORGE A. BARTON

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

---

BÉNÉDITE, GEORGES, *Le couteau de Gebel el-'Arak*. Extrait des Monuments Piot, Tome XXII.

A very important historical document has recently been published by M. Georges Bénédite, who acquired it for the Louvre in 1914. It is a neolithic flint knife of the finest workmanship, with carved ivory handle. Only five similar knives were formerly known; and only one of these (now in Brooklyn) preserves, like our subject, both blade and handle. The blade, ground and with re-flaked edge, occurs at 60 in Petrie's scale of sequences. But the distinctive feature of the new knife is its decoration. The ivory handle bears, not rows of animals, as in previously known examples, but scenes of battle and the hunt. And, most surprising of all, the aggressors in the battle scene and the huntsman on the verso both remind us, though in different ways, of Babylonia. For the former, though

<sup>1</sup> A few typographical errors might be noted:

P. 1, l. 1, for G 58 read G 53.

P. 1, l. 2, for I will cause ye read I will cause you.

P. 11, first line of descr., for Asalf read Asasif.

P. 17, second col. of authorities, Boeser's publisher is not Nitjhoff, but Nijhoff.

nude, are short-haired (or shaven-headed) and short-necked, a quasi-Sumerian type; while the huntsman, with long robe, cap, and beard, suggests Naramsin and his Semitic contemporaries.<sup>1</sup> The lions which he holds are a closer match for a pair ward off by Gilgamesh on the seal of Queen Barnamtarra of Lagash<sup>2</sup> than for the ratlike creatures who constitute their closest Egyptian kin in a prehistoric tomb-painting from Hieraconpolis.

Returning to the battle, even the ships of the invaders, with their flat bottoms, high upcurved bow and stern, and crescent standards, are most akin to those incised on a pair of pottery vase-fragments from Telloh and Susa respectively,<sup>3</sup> which are so alike in clay, technique, shape, decoration, etc., that both vases might have been made by the same hand. While the Telloh fragment was near the surface and evidently displaced, the Susa fragment was found five or six meters deep, between zones of fine and of coarse painted pottery. The common site of manufacture of the two pieces may well have been in Babylonia, for Heuzey notes that a ship of the same type, the *belem*, is still used there. The date of these early representations, though uncertain, will hardly have been later than 2500 B.C.

That the same type of ship has been in use since long before that date is evident from its appearance on the newly discovered Egyptian knife. For the knife is certainly an Egyptian product. Not only have all the kindred examples known been found in Egypt, but also, though the details mentioned above find their closest parallels in Asia, the general style of the decoration is as undeniably Egyptian as are the papyrus-boats of the long-haired defenders in the battle scene. M. Bénédite confirms the evidence of the blade for an early predynastic date by a careful comparative study of the handle in the light of other early Egyptian materials employing similar subjects and technique, viz., slate palettes, mace-heads, and carved ivories. The knife becomes, then, our most definite token of one of many probable waves of Asiatic migration into neolithic Egypt.<sup>4</sup>

T. GEORGE ALLEN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

<sup>1</sup> It is to be regretted that M. Bénédite's enlarged reproductions of the handle were not included among his héliogravures, as many details upon which interpretation depends must be read into the half-tones from the text.

<sup>2</sup> *Revue d'Assyr.*, VI, Pl. VII (marked Pl. III in Livr. 4).

<sup>3</sup> *Revue d'Assyr.*, VI, Pl. III. Cf. too Ward, *Seal Cylinders of Western Asia*, Ch. VI. A similar boat is shown in relief on a vase from Bismya, now in Haskell Museum at the University of Chicago (published by Banks, *Bismya*, p. 139).

<sup>4</sup> Professor Petrie (in *Ancient Egypt* [1917], pp. 26-36) gives an illustrated synopsis of M. Bénédite's paper for English readers, followed by comments of his own. These include an admirable summary of the reasons for continuing to interpret the carved palettes as such, rather than as votive shields. Professor Petrie then proceeds to the larger question of the relative age of civilization in Egypt and Babylonia. He assumes that a common progress from Solutrean to Magdalenian types of worked flints, which he has rendered probable for such widely separated points as England and Egypt (see *Ancient Egypt* [1915]), holds also in Babylonia. Then, stretching his assumption to imply uniformity of succession not only relatively but also in point of absolute time, he argues on this fallacious basis that the finely decorated pottery found with Solutrean types of flints in the low levels of Susa shows a civilization a whole cycle earlier than that of the predynastic Egyptian graves with their Magdalenian flints. This system of reasoning must, of course, leave out of account the stage of progress evident in Egyptian work of the First Dynasty and earlier as compared with the crudities of art in the Tigro-Euphrates region as late as 3000 B.C.